



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/420,334	10/18/1999	STEVEN D. LACY	10555/004001	2647
26181	7590	05/05/2004	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. 3300 DAIN RAUSCHER PLAZA MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			MARSCHEL, ARDIN H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1631	
DATE MAILED: 05/05/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/420,334	Applicant(s) LACY ET AL.	
	Examiner Ardin Marschel	Art Unit 1631	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2003 and 17 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35, 37-71, and 73-78 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35, 37-71, and 73-78 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' arguments, filed 12/4/03 and 2/17/04, have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

NON-STATUTORY SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 30-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Consideration of the "Computer-Related Inventions" section of the MPEP at section 2106, Part IV, subpart B, has revealed that the above listed instant claims are directed to non-statutory subject matter without requiring performance of a result outside of a computer. Thus, the manipulation of data or conversion of data, in this case defining a set of one or more sources, defining a plurality of mappings, receiving an input, and generating a representation is the claimed subject matter without any required physical transformation outside of a computer. The receiving input step in claim 30, for example, lacks any user input as in claim 1 thus such receiving is reasonably interpreted to be computer data input to a program from an unspecified source, such as a data file, also within the computer. The generating step in the last 2 lines of claim 30 is clearly directed to electronic data and not a display or physical transformation. Also, for example, it is well known that a software program may output results to a computer file and not display it, for example, outside of the computer.

PRIOR ART

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-35, 37-71, and 73-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flavin et al. (P/N 6,044,212); taken in view of Schultz et al. (P/N 6,004,617).

This rejection is reiterated and maintained from the previous office action, mailed 6/30/03. Applicants have argued Flavin et al. and Schultz et al. separately. Applicants are reminded that this rejection is not based on each of these references separately, but rather on the combination of references. As set forth in the basis for this rejection in said previous office action, Flavin et al. sets for software combinatorial design practice

Art Unit: 1631

but lacks details regarding initial values of reagent concentrations and the type of reagents in reaction wells thus leaving someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to utilize combinatorial library practice as to these details from the prior art of which Schultz et al. is a description of such details for combinatorial library preparation, including gradient practice for such initial values. Thus, Flavin et al. was described in said office action as motivating and suggesting such prior art practice which is supplied by Schultz et al. Applicants have not argued nor negated this combination of references by arguments against each reference separately.

Applicants also requested further explanation of the basis of rejection of instant claims which require a set of equations as limitations, such as claims 19-29 and 55-65. A set of equations is well known to be a set of formulations wherein each such formulation is practiced so that one quantity is equated to another. Schultz et al. describes uniform or gradient practice in column 10, lines 30-33, as producing "either a single stoichiometry or, alternatively, a large number of stoichiometries within a single predefined region". Such stoichiometries equate quantities of materials to each reaction well. For example 1:1 stoichiometry is a well known type of such equating of materials, as well as 1:2 etc., however such specifics of what is well known are not cited specifically in Schultz et al.

No claim is allowed.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the Central PTO Fax Center. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61

Art Unit: 1631

(November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993)(See 37 CFR § 1.6(d)).
The Central PTO Fax Center number is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ardin Marschel, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0718. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8 A.M. to 4 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward, Ph.D., can be reached on (571) 272-0722.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to Legal Instrument Examiner, Tina Plunkett, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0549.

April 30, 2004

Ardin H. Marschel
ARDIN H. MARSCHEL
4/30/04